

## I-405 Corridor Program

### Executive Committee Meeting May 22, 2002 Draft—Meeting Summary

*The following is a summary of presentations given, issues raised, actions undertaken or recommendations made. When possible, lengthy discussions have been summarized into themes or summary statements.*

#### Executive Committee members in attendance

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>George Kargianis</b><br>Chair                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Rob McKenna</b><br>Transportation<br>Improvement Board | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Dan Mathis</b><br>FHWA                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Sants Contreras (Alt.)</b><br>City of Kirkland              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Sen. Horn</b><br>WA State Senate                       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Sen. Margarita Prentice</b><br>WA State Senate |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Connie Marshall</b><br>City of Bellevue          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Bob Edwards</b><br>PSRC                                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Randy Corman</b><br>City of Renton             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <b>John Okamoto</b><br>WSDOT                                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Rosemarie Ives</b><br>City of Redmond                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Steve Mullet</b><br>City of Tukwila            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Dick Paylor</b><br>City of Bothell               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Joan McBride</b><br>City of Kirkland                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Grant Degginger (Alt.)</b><br>City of Bellevue |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Sonny Putter</b><br>City of Newcastle            | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Pam Carter (Alt.)</b><br>City of Tukwila                          | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Aubrey Davis (Alt.)</b><br>WSTC                           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>David Dye (Alt.)</b><br>WSDOT                    | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Dave Gossett</b><br>Snohomish County                              | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Jeff Sax</b><br>Snohomish County                          |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Rep. Cheryl Pflug</b><br>WA State House of Reps. | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Rep. Christopher Hurst</b><br>WA State House of Reps.             | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Tom Paine (Alt.)</b><br>City of Redmond                   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Chuck Mosher</b><br>Sound Transit                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Harold Taniguchi</b><br>King County                    | <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Tim Olsen</b><br>City of Bothell                          |

**Staff and Observers**

Chris Johnson, King County  
Kim Becklund, City of Bellevue  
Peter Beaulieu, PSRC  
Bruce Nurse, Kemper Development  
Kevin Shively, Transportation Choices  
Greg Zimmerman, City of Renton

Jim Leonard, FHWA  
Milt Smith, HNTB  
Ann Martin, King County DOT  
Mary Alyce Burleigh, City of Kirkland  
Johannes Kurz, Snohomish County  
Jeff Switzer, Eastside Journal

**Project Management Team**

Mike Cummings, WSDOT  
Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates  
Ron Anderson, DEA

Craig Stone, WSDOT  
Paul Bergman, PRR  
Fen Hsiao, PRR

## **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Kargianis called the meeting to order at 9:12 a.m. He reviewed the meeting Agenda:

- EIS Update
- Process Overview: State and Regional
- Funding: What's been Assigned?
- Funding: What's being Discussed? And what's this mean for this project
- I-405 Guiding Principles
- Review and Discuss Subcommittee's Preliminary Implementation Concept

Chairman Kargianis turned the meeting over to Craig Stone, WSDOT to discuss the meeting's focus and give a program update. Mr. Stone said staff wanted to call today's special meeting to report on the outcome of the funding and phasing subcommittee and recent regional funding discussions. He said staff would like guidance on the funding principles and concepts they will be sharing with the committee today. Mr. Stone said today's meeting will be the first of three to discuss the direction on the concept.

Mr. Stone turned the meeting over to Mike Cummings, WSDOT, for an EIS update.

## **Road to Record of Decision:**

- January
  - Environmental Program: approach, goals, objectives
  - Preferred Alternative: Refine
- February
  - Environmental Program: Draft mitigation concept
- March/April
  - Environmental Program: Environmental Mitigation Concept
  - Concurrence Point #3 & Preliminary FEIS
- June: Publish FEIS
- July: Record of Decision

## **Status: Interagency Concurrence for the I-405 Program:**

1. Preferred Alternative and Mitigation Concept
2. Pursue adoption of plans and programs to implement the I-405 Corridor Program
3. Not to revisit previous Concurrences unless there is substantial new information or substantial changes occur.

## **Concurrence Point 3:**

- Concurrence Packet Distributed: March 19, 2002
- Concurrence Requested by April 5, 2002
- Twenty-two agencies requested to concur with:
  - Preferred Alternative
  - Mitigation Concept
- Nineteen have formally responded
- Negotiations and/or contracts have been made with all agencies that have not concurred or have not responded
- Has delayed publication of Final Environmental Impact Statement
- Preferred Alternative
  - Concurred 19: 1 HCT component only

- Pending 3
- Mitigation Concept
  - Concurred 16
  - Non-concurrence 3
  - Pending 3

Pending: Redmond, Kirkland, US Fish & Wildlife

### **Concurrence Point #3 Proposal**

- Initiating Dispute Resolution Process
  - May 22, 2002
  - Define issues
- Co-Lead Negotiation Team (ST, WSDOT, KC, FHWA, FTA)
  - Executive Committee Advisory Group
  - Meeting 7-10 days

Mr. Cummings said that a number of agencies want more information before concurring and this has delayed the FEIS schedule.

He said the non-concurring agencies are EPA, Core of Engineers and U.S. Fish and Wildlife (USFW) in regards to the mitigation concept. The farthest from concurring is U.S. Fish and Wildlife.

Chairman Kargianis asked what the concern is with USFW. Mr. Cummings said the issue with non-concurring agencies is primarily related to sub-basin mitigation issues, and defining whether the program has opportunities to mitigate wetlands. He said the agencies are getting fairly close to concurring but want additional data beforehand. He said copies of each agency's issues are available if the group would like him to pass them around. Chairman Kargianis asked Mr. Cummings to hand them out.

Mayor Ives, City of Redmond, said Redmond is not sure what the implications of concurrence are. She said the city has only a couple of issues. She said the first issue is that of the program taking up to 18 years of construction. She said Redmond wants to see the implementation for transit and TDM right up front so people will have alternative modes of transport that will already be in place during construction.

Ms. Ives said the other issues regard Sound Transit and sub-area equity. The I-405 and SR 520 interchange needs to have a commitment behind it. She said it's already a mess and needs to be recognized as a major interchange that's in trouble. Ms. Ives said she wants to see program partners support this.

Ms. Ives said that staff needs to think about the fact that it won't be able to get enough money for the corridor. Voters will ask if they are getting value for their votes in regards to the state package and regional package. She said that resources are limited and staff needs to look at stand alone projects that will give voters return for their dollar. She emphasized to the committee that this is the time to scrutinize the program elements and principles.

Senator Horn said that scrutinizing and delaying might not accomplish what the program wants. He said that \$39 million dollars was taken off the table for Translake because of the controversy over the I-405 and SR 520 interchange.

Mr. Cummings said he wants the group to understand that concurrence is not a position on phasing and funding; it is only a position on the program vision. He said phasing and funding would be addressed in the next step.

Chuck Mosher, Sound Transit, asked if there are some agencies that will never concur, and if so, what does this mean. Mr. Cummings said that if some key agencies don't concur, it might cripple main program elements. Mr. Cummings said that the I-405 program is the first to go through this type of program and get this far.

Mr. Cummings said that non-concurrence doesn't necessarily mean the program can't move forward. Therefore, the program will continue to move forward while staff tries to reach an agreement with the agencies at the same time. Mr. Cummings said staff is suggesting the issuance of a dispute resolution for the agencies that haven't submitted concurrence or that haven't concurred and defined what the issues are. Mr. Cummings said they would like the co-lead from the non-concurring agencies to meet with staff and explain the reasons.

Mr. Cummings asked if the committee has any concerns about proceeding in this manner. The committee did not have any concerns.

Mr. Cummings returned the meeting to Mr. Stone to provide a State and Regional Transportation Funding Overview.

**Statewide Referendum: Transportation Investments:**

• State Highways	\$5,440 M
• City and County Roads	\$447 M
• Washington State Ferries	\$681 M
• Rail System Improvements	\$294 M
• <u>Public Transportation</u>	<u>\$820 M</u>
Total	\$7,682 M

**Legislative Intent:**

- ESHB 2969: Created 9 Cent Gas Tax
- ESSB 6347: New Law Transportation Investment
  - Section 301:
    - I-405: \$1.77 Billion (\$270 M pre-construction)
    - SR 509: \$500 Million (\$122 M pre-construction)
    - AWV: \$450 Million (\$70 M pre-construction)
    - TransLake: \$100 Million (EIS)
  - “Unless otherwise specified, the appropriations for highway capacity expansion in sections 301 through 307 of this act are provided solely for general purpose expansion.”

Chairman Kargianis asked if the 9-cent gas tax is per Referendum 51. Mr. Stone said yes.

**State Funding Overview:**

- State Funding
  - AWV: \$450 M
  - I-405: \$1.77 B
  - SR 509: \$500 M
  - TransLake: \$100 M
- Other State Projects
  - I-5 HOV
  - I-90
  - SR 18
  - SR 167 HOV

Senator Horn pointed out to Ms. Ives the loss of money due to specific program projects per the slide. Ms. Ives said that regardless of individual elected officials, the region shouldn't ignore an unsafe bridge. She said they shouldn't walk away from the projects because of controversy.

Senator Horn said that this group sets a basis for which other groups are going to operate from. He said the region has lost \$300 million for Translake while other amounts have been decreased due to lack of project specifics.

Chairman Kargianis agreed that when the legislature eliminated money it has never been replaced. He said that funding hasn't kept up with transportation and growth requirements over the last years. He said that under-funding has put the infrastructure in disarray. He emphasized the region is in dire straits. Chairman Kargianis said the committee is just trying to look at available funding and proceed forward with this project in conjunction with what else is required in the region.

Ms. Ives said Redmond hasn't responded to concurrence because of issues that are pivotal to the program acting responsibly to the corridor.

Mr. Stone mentioned that the slide doesn't include SR 167, which also has funding.

#### **Potential Regional Funding:**

	Three County	King
High:	\$21 B	\$14 B
Medium:	\$14 B	\$10 B
Low:	\$9 B	\$6 B

Mr. Stone said there is less definition on the regional package whereas the state package has been largely defined.

#### **Legislative Intent:**

- ESSSB 6140: Regional Bill
  - Minimum performance criteria for project selection:
    - Reduce congestion and improve safety
    - Improve travel time
    - Improve air quality
    - Increase daily and peak period person and vehicle trip capacity
    - Reduce person and vehicle delay
    - Improve freight mobility
    - Cost-effective

- Other rules and standards adopted by Transportation Commission or successor

#### **Regional Funding Overview:**

- Executives' Regional Proposal
  - AWV: \$1.5 - 2.0 B
  - I-405: \$1 – 1.4 B
  - SR 509: \$200 M
  - TransLake: \$800 M – 1.4 B
  - ST Light Rail: \$

Mr. Stone said these numbers have been published and were released on May 2.

Mr. Stone reviewed the process for Integrating the Regional and State Packages. He said staff is working with content and specific scope, budget and schedule.

Mr. Stone reviewed the Draft – Funding Process/Schedule:

- Draft Plan – Mid-June
- Final Plan – End-July
- RTID Approval – Mid-August
- State Approval – Mid-August
- County Approval – Early-Sept.
- Ballot Measure – Mid-Sept.
- Public Vote – 11/5

Mr. Stone said the program is heading towards a late May date for providing what's going to be in the official RTID packages. This is why the special meeting was called to discuss what would be in the package. Mr. Stone said the committee still needs to discuss what the recommendation of the state package will be for commission approval.

Chairman Kargianis asked if staff anticipates the regional package will be on the November ballot. Mr. Stone said they are trying to anticipate the fastest schedule possible.

Representative Pflug asked how the regional plan would come together by November. Where will they get the staff support to put it together? Or are they talking about moving forward with the Executive's proposal in November? David Dye, WSDOT, said the language in the bill directs the department to provide staff support but there is no current money provided. Therefore, the program will be using existing staff until then. He said staff wants to enable this group and decide if it's reasonable to get a package on the November ballot. However, they didn't want to be in the position of waiting and not being prepared to move when given approval.

Chairman Kargianis said the committee has to have certain assumptions. He asked Rob McKenna, Transportation Improvement Board, what the reality of this is. Mr. McKenna said the informal group that's been meeting is working towards a recommendation for whether the program will go for a November ballot. He said they have to make a decision in June and will have a recommendation to bring before the Executive Committee then.

Mr. McKenna said the next RTID meeting would be on June 11. He said they have asked staff to bring information to the meeting to help figure out if they will have enough scope and budget to make mega project feasible for the November ballot. He said there needs to be enough time for staff to get it all put together and still have enough time to campaign. He said they are dealing with a new mechanism, new taxes and lots of projects. Mr. McKenna said he doesn't know if it will help to have all the projects together on the same ballot.

He said that Mr. Dye's team would brief the group on the CEVP for mega projects. At the June 11<sup>th</sup> meeting a polling expert will sift through previous research. Staff thinks they will know by mid June about the November ballot. However, it's good staff is doing early work because it will be useful if there is a spring vote, too.

#### **Mega Projects Major Issues:**

- Level of design
- Lack of a preferred alternative -- TransLake, I-90 and AWV
- Cost Schedule
- Cost estimate validation process (CEVP)
- Environmental Clearance
- Tolls

Mr. Stone said that the program is at 1 percent design.

Mr. Stone said that all costs are dollars that will be expended as the project moves forward. How fast the program moves forward affects costs dramatically. He said they need to think seriously about the schedule and balance it in regards to revenue. He said they are looking to have more CEVP information in June.

#### **Value Pricing:**

- Executives' regional proposal provides an option for electronic tolling revenues:
  - AWV: \$500M
  - Translake: \$600 M
  - I-405: \$450 M
- Range of options (electronic tolling):
  - Nothing
  - Hot lanes
  - Individual facilities (AWV, SR 520, I-405)
  - All metro freeway/highways (limited access)

Mr. Stone said staff is working with the consultant team to look at the tolling concept. In regards to I-405 there is a managed lane concept.

Mr. McKenna asked if these are 20-year figures. Mr. Dye said they are bonded over 20 years figures.

Mr. McKenna asked if the tolls would be in the HOT lanes. Mr. Stone said tolls would be employed in the entire facility. Mr. Dye said staff would have more information and numbers later. He said they need to refine the numbers because they appear to be on the high end of what's reasonable for all the facilities.



Ms. Pflug asked if they would be looking at restrictions against tolling existing roads when they refine the numbers. Chairman Kargianis said it would only be in the new facility. Mr. Dye said staff would bring in information that isn't limited by current legislation.

Ms. McBride mentioned the transportation value pricing conference to be held in Bellevue next Wednesday.

Senator Horn said he thinks the group should be aware of the impact tolls will have on the vote. He said they should be concerned and avoid too much discussion of tolls because of what it will do to the vote.

Chairman Kargianis said one way to pay for the projects is by tolls, and most people don't want to pay for anything. He said how the program puts across the issue is going to be sensitive. Senator Horn said that lots of discussion before the vote will frighten people.

Ms. McBride emphasized that value pricing isn't just tolls. She said that community conversation needs to happen. The community is asking why the program isn't talking about pricing or tolling. She said that if the group doesn't have the courage to discuss the issue, than they aren't doing their jobs.

Mr. Stone said the I-405 program is only talking about a managed lanes concept, not specifically tolling. He said staff wants to report back on the managed lane analysis at the June 18 Executive meeting. He said that the current estimated numbers are very high.

#### **I-405 Program Funding and Implementation Focus for Discussion:**

- Review and discuss principles and themes
- Discuss preliminary implementation concept and refinements
- Provide guidance to program building effort

Paul Bergman, PRR, handed out the meeting summary for the previous funding and phasing subcommittee meeting that was also emailed to the committee members.

#### **Potential I-405 Funding:**

Statewide Referendum: \$1.77 B

- Engineering & Right-of-way
- 5% Design for Full Corridor
- SR 167/I-405 Interchange
- SB I-405 (SE 8<sup>th</sup> – Factoria)

Regional Referendum:

- I-405 Capacity      \$1.0 - 1.45\* B
- I-405 Transit      \$ 330 M
- Other      \$ 500 M

Total      \$3.6 - 4\* B

*\* Includes tolls*

Mr. Stone said that other components include park and rides and arterial improvements in the area.

Chairman Kargianis said the concept of studying whether or not there should be a charge for park and rides was raised before. Mr. Stone said this hasn't been part of the vision.

Senator Horn said he is concerned about a funding chart like this. He said this is trying to do something for everybody and in doing so, does nothing for everyone. He said they should be talking about getting the project done in 10 years. However, if they go with an approach like this, they will be working on it for 20 years.

Chairman Kargianis said that through out the Executive Committee meeting discussions the vision has been that the program would start a series of simultaneous construction schedules. He said the group wants to complete the project within 10 years. He asked what control the group has over the regional referendum.

He asked if staff is concerned about the allocation of funding. He asked if staff is concerned about the total sum raised by the regional referendum and if it will be sufficient to complete the projects.

Ms. Pflug said she shares the same concerns. However, it is not necessarily within the charter of this particular body to review everything within the regional plan. But, it is within the committee's charter to discuss how I-405 will be completed and on schedule. She said the total cost figure is important.

She said that she thinks the program should have a little bit of margin. She suggested passing a resolution that encourages the regional transportation investment body to include a figure in their plan that has at least \$2 billion for I-405. Chairman Kargianis noted the figure is currently \$1.4 billion. Ms. Pflug said the committee should encourage everybody that actually has legislative authority.

Chairman Kargianis asked Mr. Stone why the committee is looking at these amounts when they aren't adequate for the project. Mr. Stone said staff is still looking at high and low scenarios. He said these figures are just out there to make sure the committee knows what's been put out by the county executives'. However, staff is not advocating it. But, the media has reported the figures, so staff wants to let the committee know.

Chairman Kargianis asked what staff has been doing to shape the regional package. Mr. Stone said staff has been asked to provide cost estimates, scope and engineering. Also, staff has laid out the Executive Committee Schedule:

- May 14: F & P Subcommittee -- Principles and Preliminary Concepts
- May 22: Executive Committee Review
- June 13: F & P Subcommittee -- Draft Implementation Plan
- June 18: Executive Committee Review
- July 11: F & P Subcommittee – Finalize Implementation Plan
- July 23: Executive Committee Recommendations

Mr. Stone said that the role of the Executive Committee is to provide input to the Secretary of Transportation of its desires for the program. Chairman Kargianis asked if by adopting the PA, hasn't the committee already indicated what its vision is for the program.

Mr. Dye noted that enough money would never be generated for the high scenarios. What will happen is staff will either shrink the list of projects to be completed in their entirety or more projects will be done not in their entirety. He said staff wants to seek input or guiding principles from the committee as we provide data to the regional group. If it's not going to be everything, staff wants to offer what the committee wants to do with the funding the program gets. He said staff is looking for guidance on how to provide segment information.

Ms. McBride said that Kirkland is moving towards concurrence. She said she would like to present a letter written yesterday by the city council. The letter notes that the city has concerns about the package and what can be built. The city supports the vision to reduce congestion. The letter addresses phasing and funding. The city would like the Executive Committee to consider adding a project to the list that will address Kirkland congestion. She said the city has proposed the examination of 3 key interchanges. She said these improvements would help out regionally, as well as locally.

Mr. Corman said he is in favor of passing the motion that identifies why the committee thinks the program should go forward in the way the committee envisioned it. He said because there have been past problems with Sound Transit, it is especially important to properly manage the projects. He said the committee can't just say it will sprinkle the money appropriately. They need to be specific and build-out to ultimate on specified projects. He emphasized to need to avoid being general and the need for a clear concept. He said they also need to make sure the federal government is on board. He said they need to produce projects they have asked voters to commit to.

Ms. Pflug agreed that this is the key point. She said the can't give regional voters the opportunity to defeat these plans. If regional voters aren't supportive than the rest of state won't be either. She said the group needs to clearly articulate exactly what we want.

Margarite Prentice, WA State Senate, said all projects are needed to improve the area. She said they must stay with regional thinking.

Mr. Corman moved to pass the resolution that the committee feels the regional package should reflect the PA and only a regional package of that nature can be put on the ballot. Steve Mullet, City of Tukwila seconded the motion.

Ms. McBride said this puts her in an awkward position because Kirkland hasn't concurred yet. She emphasized that the committee has issued a PA and they are on the record as stating what they want. She said she is worried about resolutions that put the program out against other regional projects. The regional and state package will only fund a portion of what is needed for I-405. She warned that if the program goes too far, it might not get anything.

Ms. McBride said she wants a true regional package. She said they should consider the idea of phasing the projects that make the most sense for I-405. She said that if they fix the most problem areas first, people will appreciate increased mobility and will be willing to eventually fund other projects.

Chuck Mosher, Sound Transit, said I-405 is planned for and set up, so why should we wait for the other projects. He emphasized the I-405 program is ready to go.

Dick Paylor, City of Bothell, said they shouldn't have to choose between passion for I-405 and the region. He said the I-405 could rise to the top by being an example for how other projects should put their packages together. He said that when the committee came up with the PA, it included what projects they would do first for the amount of money they have. He said it looks like the regional package was put together around what will most likely pass, not what is most urgent.

He said that I-405 should get built ahead of the viaduct because it's where the biggest problem is. As to the motion, Mr. Paylor said they need to make sure they take more time to get something good that they will be able to speak outside of the group about it.

Chairman Kargianis said the motion stated that funding should be sought accordingly in regards to the PA.

Mr. Paylor said the motion makes it sound like I-405 is all the committee cares about. What they put in the regional package should be based upon established criteria that follow what the I-405 program has already established.

Mr. Stone said he would first discuss the implementation principles for the committee's reference.

Ms. Ives said the committee has the PA that they've endorsed. She said the motion is premature and she wants to see her issues addressed first. She said they need to make a statement on how the program is going to implement early implementation of transit. She said the other issue is of sub area equity and the fact that the I-405/SR 520 interchange is currently ignored. Thirdly, she said that the program needs to implement the projects that will deliver the most benefit first. This group needs to do these three components and then resolution.

Mr. Taniguchi said this discussion is sounding like it's favoring I-405 as the regional package. However, there are other projects needed and they need to find a balance.

Mr. Dye said that from a staff perspective, they are just going to provide technical information on segments of this project. He said he encourages the group to engage in a conversation staff is trying to lead them through in regards to what projects should be done first if they don't receive full funding. He said staff needs guiding principles if the program is forced into this scenario.

Mr. Corman said it's important to think regionally. He said he doesn't want to approve a plan where money is going to be sprinkled all over the place instead of being specific on what voters will get. He said the public needs to know the whole project will get done. There needs to be a complete commitment to the whole project. He said Kirkland is worried because it looks like there will be splintering and that's why they have written this letter asking to be among the first projects.

Chairman Kargianis said that as a group if they imply they can complete the program for less money than the full amount, they will not receive the full amount. He said they should be adamant about getting the entire funding.

Mr. McKenna reviewed the Proposed I-405 Implementation Principles:

- Fulfill the Vision
- Worst First
- Finish Complete Logical Segments
- Geographic Investments
- Modal Balance
- Achieve Early Actions
- Early Environmental Action
- Minimize Overall Costs & Risks
- Minimize Construction Impacts

Mr. McKenna said the numbers don't include transit investments that would come from sources like Sound Transit. He said the RTID is starting with this first draft. One of the reasons revenue is limited in the first draft is because the other two counties will not support Sound Transit being included in this ballot. Seattle wants the viaduct and light rail to jump on board.

Mr. McKenna recommended that the funding and phasing principles be adopted by the committee. He said they lay out the systematic approach in getting to the PA vision.

Chairman Kargianis asked if the committee wants to amend the resolution to include the subcommittee recommendations including the principles and implementation.

Bob Edwards, PSRC, said I-509 is looking at phasing. He said he supports the subcommittee recommendations.

Senator Horn said this project needs to be done in 10 years with design build contracts done simultaneously. He emphasized that they cannot afford a phasing approach. He said there needs to be discussion on the scheduling for every approach. He said they need to match the projects against a set of criteria.

Ms. Pflug said they need to think regionally. If they emphasize getting I-405 done, that's not against the idea of thinking regionally.

Ms. McBride said Kirkland could support the subcommittee recommendation. She said they can also support Senator Horn's recommendation. However, she thinks the program will be phased and if so, it needs to be done in the best possible way. She said she wants to support Senator Horn's criteria but also the subcommittee's phasing idea.

Paul Bergman reviewed the major elements of the motion:

- Regional funding package should reflect vision of program
- Legislative criteria should determine project selections for funding
- Funding and Phasing Subcommittee recommendation

Mr. McKenna said he wants to recommend asking for \$8 billion. He said they shouldn't be shy about asking for money because other projects won't be shy, either.

Ms. McBride said Kirkland is supportive of early implementation. Mr. McKenna said the RTID planning committee is already talking about how to fund early implementation.

Chairman Kargianis asked who is in favor of the revised motion as outlined. The motioned passed by consensus.

Chairman Kargianis adjourned the meeting at 11:07 a.m.